

331.89  
Un33i



**CENTRAL CIRCULATION BOOKSTACKS**

The person charging this material is responsible for its renewal or its return to the library from which it was borrowed on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below. **You may be charged a minimum fee of \$75.00 for each lost book.**

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

TO RENEW CALL TELEPHONE CENTER, 333-8400

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

MAY 17 1999

MAY 24 1999

UNIVE  
ILLINOI  
AT URBAN  
ST

When renewing by phone, write new due date below previous due date. L162



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2018 with funding from  
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Alternates

<https://archive.org/details/investigatingstr00unit>



## INVESTIGATING STRIKE IN STEEL INDUSTRIES.

NOVEMBER 3 (calendar day, November 8), 1919.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KENYON, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following

### REPORT.

[Pursuant to S. Res. 188.]

On the 23d day of September, 1919, the Senate passed a resolution instructing the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate immediately to investigate the steel strike and report to the Senate within the shortest possible time the cause and reason therefor.

The committee, acting through a subcommittee, visited the strike region in western Pennsylvania; went through a number of the mills; talked with the men working in the mills and with the strikers; visited homes of the men and heard evidence for two days at Pittsburgh.

Rather extended hearings have also been held in Washington, and approximately 100 witnesses have been examined. The committee has heard from both sides of the controversy and tried in every way to secure the facts bearing upon this situation.

#### FACTS LEADING UP TO THE STRIKE

It appears that in 1892 there was a general strike in the steel industry commonly known as the "Homestead strike"—Homestead being a suburb of Pittsburgh, Pa., and the seat of one of the largest steel plants in the country. That strike was fought with great bitterness and finally resulted in failure, and from that time on there have been no attempts at organizing labor in the steel industry until June, 1918. As to what happened then, Mr. John Fitzpatrick, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, thus testified:

The labor organizations, realizing what tremendous influence the steel industry has on all other industries, made up its mind that it would have to organize the steel industry, no matter at what cost, because in all other industries labor has made considerable progress, has established the eight-hour day, has established decent standards of living and labor, but in the steel



mills hours are long, wages are small, below the pauper line; and with that kind of a condition used as an argument against the efforts of labor elsewhere, labor understood the necessity of organizing the steel mills.

So at the St. Paul convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in June, 1918, a resolution was presented calling upon the American Federation of Labor to bring the organizations interested in the steel industry together so that they might map out a plan of action within the scope and tactics of the American Federation of Labor for the purpose of organizing the steel mills.

A resolution was adopted by unanimous vote. The president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Gompers, was instructed, under the terms of the resolution, to call into meeting the organizations who had an interest in the steel mills.

The meeting was called to meet in the city of Chicago about August 1, 1918. Twenty-four international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor responded to the call, and campaign committees to organize the iron and steel industries were organized.

Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, was elected chairman and William Z. Foster, general organizer of the Brotherhood of Carmen of America, was elected as the secretary.

Mr. Fitzpatrick further testified that up to that time there had been no real unionism in the steel mills since 1892.

Mr. Fitzpatrick further testified that by May, 1919, their organizers had some 80,000 men in the Pittsburgh and Calumet districts within the organization. When the American Federation of Labor convention of June, 1919, convened, Mr. Fitzpatrick reported that over 100,000 men were within the organization.

The Atlantic City convention instructed Mr. Gompers to enter into negotiations with Mr. E. H. Gary, chairman of the board of directors of the Steel Corporation, in reference to having a better understanding with the steel company. Mr. Gompers wrote a letter to Mr. Gary, but Mr. Gary did not reply to the letter. The letter referred to is as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
THE ALAMAC HOTEL,  
Atlantic City, N. J., June 20, 1919.

MR. ELBERT H. GARY, *Chairman Board of Directors,*  
*U. S. Steel Corporation, New York, N. Y.*

DEAR SIR: Of course you are aware that upon the request of a number of men in the employ of the United States Steel Corporation, and realizing the need of it, the convention of the American Federation of Labor decided to respond and give such assistance as is possible in order to bring about more thorough organization of the workers in the iron and steel industry, particularly those employed by your corporation.

A campaign of organization was begun in June, 1918, and within that period we have secured the organization of more than 100,000 of the employees in the iron and steel industry. The prospects for the complete organization are, I am informed, exceedingly bright.

Of course, knowing the policy of the organized labor movement I have the honor in part to represent, we aim to accomplish the purposes of our labor movement; that is, better conditions for the toilers by American methods, American understandings, and not by revolutionary methods or the inauguration of a cataclysm.

We believe in the effort of employer and employees to sit down around a table and, meeting thus, face to face, and having a better understanding of each other's position in regard to conditions of labor, to hours, standards, etc., and after reaching an amicable understanding to enter into an agreement for collective bargaining that is to cover wages, hours of labor, conditions of employment, etc.

At the Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor just closed the committee reported upon the progress made, and I am instructed and authorized to suggest to you whether you will consent to hold a conference



with a committee representing not only the iron and steel workers who are organized, but representing the best interests of the unorganized men in the employ of your corporation. The names of the committee I am asking you to meet are:

Assistant President Davie, Amalgamated Iron and Steel and Tin Workers.  
William Hannon, member executive board, International Association of Machinists.

Edward Evans, representing International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.  
Wm. Z. Foster, secretary of the National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers and representing the Brotherhood of Car Men of America.

John Fitzpatrick, president Chicago Federation of Labor.

If you can advise me at your early convenience that the request contained in this letter meets with your approval and that a conference can be held, I am sure I shall be additionally appreciative.

Kindly address your reply, which I trust may be favorable, to the American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C.

Respectfully, yours,

SAMUEL GOMPERS,  
*President American Federation of Labor.*

(Steel-strike hearings, p. 224.)

After this a vote was had upon a strike, the vote taking place between July 20 and August 20.

It is claimed by Mr. Fitzpatrick in his letter to the President that 98 per cent of the men voted for the strike and the committee make no finding as to the accuracy of that statement at this time. The figures have not been furnished the committee as to the vote. In any event the strike was called for the 22d day of September.

On August 20 Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Foster, and others wrote Judge Gary asking for a conference:

NEW YORK, August 26, 1919.

HON. ELBERT H. GARY, *Chairman Finance Committee,*  
*United States Steel Corporation, 71 Broadway, New York City.*

DEAR SIR: During a general campaign of organization and education conducted under the auspices of the American Federation of Labor, many thousands of men employed in the iron and steel industry made application and were enrolled as members of the various organization to which they were assigned.

This work has been carried on to a point where we feel justified in stating to you that we represent the sentiment of the vast majority of the employees in this industry, and, acting in behalf of them, we solicit of you that a hearing be given to the undersigned committee, who have been selected by the duly accredited representatives of the employees, to place before you matters that are of vital concern to them, and concerning hours of labor, wages, working conditions, and the right of collective bargaining.

The committee called at your office at 3 p. m., Tuesday, August 26, and requested a conference. We were advised by your messenger that you wished to be excused from a personal interview at this time and requested us to have our business in writing and whatever matters we wished to submit would be taken up by yourself and your colleagues and given consideration.

Therefore we are submitting in brief the principal subjects that we desired to have a conference on. The committee has an important meeting in another city on Thursday next and will leave New York at 5 o'clock on August 27, 1919. May we respectfully request that your answer be sent before that time to Mr. John Fitzgerald, Continental Hotel, Broadway and Forty-first Street, New York City?

Very truly, yours,

JOHN FITZPATRICK,  
D. J. DAVIS,  
WM. HANNON,  
EDW. J. EVANS,  
WM. Z. FOSTER,  
*Committee.*

(Steel strike hearings, p. 16.)



Judge Gary replied, refusing said conference. We insert said letter:

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,  
New York, August 27, 1919.

MESSRS. JOHN FITZPATRICK, DAVID J. DAVIS, WILLIAM HANNON, WM. Z. FOSTER,  
EDW. J. EVANS, *Committee*.

GENTLEMEN: Receipt of your communication of August 26 instant is acknowledged.

We do not think you are authorized to represent the sentiment of a majority of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries. We express no opinion concerning any other members of the iron and steel industry.

As heretofore publicly stated and repeated, our corporation and subsidiaries, although they do not combat labor unions as such, declined to discuss business with them. The corporation and subsidiaries are opposed to the "closed shop." They stand for the "open shop," which permits one to engage in any line of employment whether one does or does not belong to a labor union. This best promotes the welfare of both employees and employers. In view of the well-known attitude as above expressed, the officers of the corporation respectfully decline to discuss with you, as representatives of a labor union, any matters relating to employees. In doing so no personal discourtesy is intended.

In all decisions and acts of the corporation and subsidiaries pertaining to employees and employment their interests are of highest importance. In wage rates, living and working conditions, conservation for life and health, care and comfort in times of sickness or old age, and providing facilities for the general welfare and happiness of employees and their families, the corporation and subsidiaries have endeavored to occupy a leading and advanced position amongst employers.

It will be the object of the corporation and subsidiaries to give such consideration to employees as to show them their loyal and efficient service in the past is appreciated, and that they may expect in the future fair treatment.

Respectfully, yours,

E. H. GARY, *Chairman*.

(Steel strike hearings, p. 17.)

To which Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Foster further replied August 27, as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, August 27, 1919.

HON. ELBERT H. GARY,

*Chairman Finance Committee, United States Steel Corporation, 71 Broadway, New York City.*

DEAR SIR: We have received your answer to our request for a conference on behalf of the employees of your corporation, and we understand the first paragraph of your answer to be an absolute refusal on the part of your corporation to concede to your employees the right of collective bargaining.

You question the authority of our committee to represent the majority of your employees. The only way by which we can prove our authority is to put the strike vote into effect and we sincerely hope you will not force a strike to prove this point.

We asked for a conference for the purpose of arranging a meeting where the questions of wages, hours, conditions of employment, and collective bargaining might be discussed. Your answer is a flat refusal for such conference, which raises the question, if the accredited representatives of your employees and the international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the Federation itself are denied a conference, what chance has the employee as such to secure any consideration of the views they entertain or the complaints they may be justified in making?

We noted particularly your definition of the attitude of your corporation on the question of the open and closed shop and the positive declaration in refusing to meet representatives of union labor. These subjects are matters which might well be discussed in conference. There has not anything arisen between your corporation and the employees whom we represent in which the question of the closed shop has been even mooted.

We read with great care your statement as to the interest the corporation takes in the lives and welfare of the employees and their families, and if that



were true even in a minor degree, we would not be pressing consideration through a conference of the terrible conditions that exist. The conditions of employment, the home life, the misery in the hovels of the steel workers is beyond description. You may not be aware that the standard of life of the average steel workers is below the pauper line, which means that charitable institutions furnish to the pauper a better home, more food, clothing, light, and heat than many steel workers can bring into their lives upon the compensation received for putting forth their very best efforts in the steel industry. Surely this is a matter which will be discussed in conference.

You also made reference to the attitude of your corporation in not opposing or preventing your employees from joining labor organizations. It is a matter of common knowledge that the tactics employed by your corporation and subsidiaries have for years most effectually prevented any attempt at organization by your employees. We feel that a conference would be valuable to your corporation for the purpose of getting facts of which, judging from your letter, you seem to be uninformed.

Some few days are still at the disposal of our committee before the time limit will have expired when there will be no discretion left to the committee but to enforce the decree of your employees whom we have the honor to represent.

We submit that reason and fairness should obtain than that the alternative shall be compulsory upon us.

Surely reasonable men can find a common ground upon which we can all stand and prosper.

If you will communicate with us further upon this entire matter, please address your communication to the National Hotel, Washington, D. C., where we shall be Thursday and Friday, August 28 and 29.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN FITZPATRICK,  
D. J. DAVIS,  
WM. HANNON,  
EDW. J. EVANS,  
WM. Z. FOSTER,  
*Committee.*

(Steel strike hearings, pp. 17 and 18.)

On September 10 the President, through a telegram from Mr. Tumulty, urged postponement of action until after the industrial conference at Washington, which had been called for October. Such telegram is as follows:

HON. SAMUEL GOMPERS,

*President American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.:*

In view of the difficulty of arranging any present satisfactory mediation with regard to the steel situation, the President desires to urge upon the steel men, through you, the wisdom and desirability of postponing action of any kind until after the forthcoming industrial conference at Washington.

J. P. TUMULTY.

(Steel strike hearings, p. 4.)

Mr. Gompers on September 11 addressed the following letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick:

DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: This morning I received a telegram as follows:

"DICKINSON, N. DAK., September 10, 1919.

"HON. SAMUEL GOMPERS,

*"President American Federation of Labor,  
Washington, D. C.:*

"In view of the difficulty of arranging any present satisfactory mediation with regard to the steel situation, the President desires to urge upon the steel men, through you, the wisdom and desirability of postponing action of any kind until after the forthcoming industrial conference at Washington.

"J. P. TUMULTY."

You are aware of the reason which prevented my participating further, the past few days, in the conferences with the representatives of the various national and international unions involved in this question.



In transmitting the above to you (which I am doing by long-distance telephone from New York City), I want to express the hope that something can be done without injury to the workers and their cause to endeavor to conform to the wish expressed by the President; that even though the corporation may endeavor to provoke the men to action that they may hold themselves in leash and under self-control, consciously demonstrating their stamina and willingness to abide by the justice of their cause, and that their rights will be finally protected.

Fraternally, yours,

SAMUEL GOMPERS,  
*President of the American Federation of Labor.*

(Steel strike hearings, p. 4.)

On September 12 Mr. Fitzpatrick addressed a letter to Mr. Gompers as follows:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I received your letter, containing copy of President Wilson's telegram, and note carefully the suggestions you make thereto. On my way back to Chicago, I stopped off at Pittsburgh in order to confer with President M. F. Tighe and Secretary W. Z. Foster. We agreed to reply to your letter as follows:

You may not be aware that seven of our organizers and members have been brutally murdered in cold blood during the past few days and the campaign of terrorism on the part of the steel companies is beyond description. After a two days' conference of the responsible heads and representatives of the 24 international unions, it was decided by unanimous vote that the only way to safeguard their interests in such a situation was to set the strike for September 22. Every man connected with this movement is deeply conscious of the great responsibility devolving upon him, and it was only after every avenue of approach had been closed that the above action was taken.

Brothers Tighe, Foster, and myself considered your suggestions and finally concluded that any vague, indefinite postponement would mean absolute demoralization and utter ruin for our movement. It would be a thousand times better for the entire labor movement that we lose the strike and suffer complete defeat than to attempt postponement now, except under a definite arrangement which would absolutely and positively guarantee the steel workers substantial concessions and protection. If these things can not be guaranteed, then, in our opinion, our only hope is the strike.

The national committee will meet in Pittsburgh, Wednesday, September 17, at 11 a. m., for the purpose of planning the details and making final arrangements for the strike.

Yours, sincerely,

JOHN FITZPATRICK.

(Steel strike hearings, pp. 4 and 5.)

We present also the letter of John Fitzpatrick and others, dated September 18, 1919, addressed to the President:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *September 18, 1919.*

HON. WOODROW WILSON,

*President of the United States,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Answering your request through Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, that the date of the strike in the steel industry of this country be postponed from September 22 next, the date heretofore fixed, until after a conference called by you to meet in Washington on October 6 next, we respectfully make the following report:

For years there has been great unrest among the steel workers of our country because of the unusual, un-American, and despotic industrial conditions. Finding no redress in individual efforts, the men naturally sought, by the example of other workers through their organizations, to associate themselves for collective defense. Oppression growing beyond endurance, the call for assistance to redress grievances came from every quarter of the industry to the St. Paul convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in June, 1918. A committee consisting of representatives of the crafts engaged in this industry were ordered to and did make investigation. They found the field overripe



for organization. The enrollment of membership grew by leaps and bounds. Relief from their oppression was imminent and, yet, out of patriotic consideration to our cause, they endured the continued suffering without cessation of their labors to the end that despotism abroad might not gain thereby aid and comfort.

Immediately after armistice was declared, the men insisted upon having their wrongs righted. They were persuaded, however, to wait until the Atlantic City convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in June, 1919. Following a report made to that convention, Mr. Gompers sought a conference with Mr. Gary, chairman of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corporation, on that subject in the hope of avoiding a grave industrial conflict. Mr. Gompers, whose constructive patriotism is beyond any question, was denied even the courtesy of a reply. Then, the men insisted upon action, and following authorization for taking a vote upon a strike, beginning with July 20 and ending August 20 of this year, 98 per cent of the men voted for a strike.

Following the vote taken, a committee representing the crafts involved went to Mr. Gary for the purpose of obtaining a conference, in the hope of avoiding the strike. Mr. Gary refused to see the committee or deal with any one of them. The committee, still desirous of avoiding the conflict, laid the entire matter before the executive council of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Gompers and the executive council indorsed the actions of the men. Nevertheless, in the hope of averting conflict, an appeal was made to your honor.

Mr. Gary, obstinate in his denial to grant relief, caused such a great unrest as to necessitate calling a meeting of the presidents of the 24 crafts involved. After a thorough, calm, and deliberate review and study of the entire situation, taking into consideration all the consequences that would naturally flow therefrom, these 24 presidents, representing over 2,000,000 organized men, indorsed the strike, and set September 22, as the date thereof. The date was deferred to September 22 against the best interests of the strike solely in the hope that Mr. Gary and his associates might in the meanwhile reconsider their position, so as to avoid the otherwise inevitable conflict.

In a meeting called on September 17, at Pittsburgh, of the representatives of the aforesaid crafts for the purpose of devising ways and means of conducting the strike, your communication through Mr. Gompers, requesting that the date of the strike be postponed was received. Two days of consideration were given to the same. Everyone present desired, if it were possible to comply with your request. Your request for postponement would have been gladly granted, were it not for the following facts:

1. Mr. Gary has asserted that his men need no trained representation in their behalf in presenting their grievances, notwithstanding that they can neither economically, by lack of means, nor intelligently, by lack of schooling, cope with him or his representatives.

2. That, ever since the men started to organize, a systematic persecution was instituted, beginning with discharge and ending with murder, recalling to us vividly the days of Homestead and the reign of despotism in Russia.

3. Through the efforts of the representatives of the steel industry, officials in various localities have denied the men free assembly and free speech. Instances are too numerous where meetings have been suppressed, men arrested, tried on various unfounded charges, excessive bail required, and cruel punishment imposed, all without warrant in law and justice.

4. As one of many examples—in the city of McKeesport a meeting held by the men within their constitutional rights was broken up and men arrested and thrown into jail, charged with riot and held to the excessive bail of \$3,000 each, while one of the hirelings of the steel industry, arrested for the murder of a woman speaker at Brackenridge, Pa., is being held under bail of but \$2,500. Another patent example is, Hammond, Ind., where four defenseless union men were charged upon and killed by hired detectives of the steel industry, and witnesses in behalf of their survivors have been so intimidated and maltreated that the truth of the killing was suppressed.

5. Guns and cannon have been planted in mills, highly charged electric wires have been strung around their premises.

6. Armed men in large numbers are going about intimidating, not only the workers, but everybody in many communities who show the slightest indication of sympathy with the men.

7. Men have been discharged in increasingly large numbers day by day. Threats and intimidations are resorted to for the purpose of putting the men



in fear and preventing them from the exercise of their own free will, coerced into signing statements that they are not members, nor will become members, of any labor organization, and threatened with eviction, blacklist, denial of credit, and starvation.

8. That a forced decline of the market would be imposed so as to wipe out their holdings in stock, which they were induced to purchase in years past. Threats to move the mills and close them up indefinitely.

9. That an organized propaganda for vilification of the American Federation of Labor, spreading rumors that the strike will be delayed, and that such delay is only a sell-out.

10. Showing no opposition to the men joining dual organizations. As a result of this propaganda, the I. W. W. is making rapid headway in some of the districts.

11. That the real reason for opposition to organized labor representation on behalf of the men who have grievances is that the steel industry is preparing to cut wages and to lower the standards to prewar times, and to return to a condition that encouraged the padrone system, so prevalent in that particular industry.

Mr. President, delay is no longer possible. We have tried to find a way, but can not. We regret that for the first time your call upon organized labor can not meet with favorable response. Believe us, the fault is not ours. If delay were no more than delay, even at the cost of loss of membership in our organizations, we would urge the same to the fullest of our ability, notwithstanding the men are firmly set for an immediate strike. But delay here means the surrender of all hope. This strike is not at the call of its leaders, but that of the men involved. Win or lose, the strike is inevitable, and will continue until industrial despotism will recede from the untenable position now occupied by Mr. Gary. We have faith in your desire to bring about a conference and hope you will succeed therein. We fully understand the hardships that meanwhile will follow, and the reign of terror that unfair employers will institute. The burden falls upon the men, but the great responsibility therefor rests upon the other side.

Sincerely and patriotically, yours,

JOHN FITZPATRICK, *Chairman.*  
WM. Z. FOSTER, *Secretary.*  
DAVID J. DAVIS.  
WM. HANNON,  
J. E. McCADDEN.

(Steel strike hearings, pp. 5, 6, and 7.)

We may say in passing that the statement in the letter to Mr. Gompers that seven of the organizers and members had been brutally murdered in cold blood during the past few days is false. Many statements in the letter to the President likewise are very greatly exaggerated or false.

From the foregoing letters it would appear that the responsibility for continuing the strike under these conditions was assumed primarily by Messrs. John Fitzpatrick, M. F. Tighe, and W. Z. Foster. None of them except Mr. Tighe were connected with the steel industry.

It is not contended that the employees were permitted to pass on the President's request or were even consulted about it. These three organizers apparently were the only ones who were consulted at that time. Mr. Fitzpatrick, writing Mr. Gompers and refusing to postpone the strike, among other things said as follows:

Brothers Tighe, Foster, and myself considered your suggestions and finally concluded that any vague, indefinite postponement would mean absolute demoralization and utter ruin for our movement.

The sole responsibility, however, for the refusal to postpone the strike at the President's request can not be entirely charged to the three above mentioned. Five days after the labor leaders' letter to



Mr. Gompers there was a meeting of all the 24 responsible leaders of the unions involved and the testimony of Mr. Gompers and others shows that at the meeting to which several members came prepared to urge acceding to the request for delay all present including Mr. Gompers decided that further delay would result in the failure to hold the men from striking. The responsibility should therefore at least be shared by all alike, Mr. Gompers included. —

#### DEMANDS OF THE ORGANIZERS.

The 12 demands to be considered by the organizers of the Steel Co., in their proposed conference with Judge Gary, were as follows:

1. Right of collective bargaining.
2. Reinstatement of all men discharged for union activities with pay for time lost.
3. The eight-hour day.
4. One day's rest in seven.
5. Abolition of 24-hour shifts.
6. Increase in wages sufficient to guarantee American standards of living.
7. Standard scale of wages for all crafts and classification of the workers.
8. Double rates of pay for all overtime work and for work on Sundays and holidays.
9. Check-off system of collecting union dues and assessments.
10. Principle of seniority to apply in maintaining, reducing, and increasing working force.
11. Abolition of company account.
12. Abolition of physical examination of applicant for employment.

Mr. Fitzpatrick testified that these demands were to be the basis of discussion between the organizers and Mr. Gary.

#### MR. GARY'S ATTITUDE.

The company's attitude on these questions is thus put forth in a letter of Mr. Gary to the officers of the subsidiary companies, inserted in the record and which is as follows:

Not long since I respectfully declined to meet, for the purpose of discussing matters pertaining to labor at our various plants, a number of gentlemen representing certain labor unions. They claim this furnishes cause for complaint and have stated that they intend, if possible, to prevent a continuance of operations at our mills and factories.

I deem it proper to repeat in a letter what heretofore has been said to you verbally. I entertain no feeling or animosity toward the gentlemen personally and would not hesitate to meet them as individuals, but I did not consider it proper to confer with them under the circumstances.

The declaration was made for two reasons: First, because I did not believe the gentlemen were authorized to speak for large numbers of our employees, whose interests and wishes are of prime importance. Secondly, because a conference with these men would have been treated by them as a recognition of the "closed-shop" method of employment. We do not combat labor unions as such. We do not negotiate with labor unions, because it would indicate the closing of our shops against nonunion labor; and large numbers of our workmen are not members of unions and do not care to be.

The principle of "open shop" is vital to the greatest industrial progress and prosperity. It is of equal benefit to employer and employee. It means that



every man may engage in any line of employment that he selects, and under such terms as he and the employer may agree upon; that he may arrange for the kind and character of work which he believes will bring to him the largest compensation and the most satisfactory conditions, depending upon his own merit and disposition.

The "closed shop" means that no man can obtain employment in that shop except through and upon the terms and conditions imposed by the labor unions. He is compelled to join the union and to submit to the dictation of its leader before he can enter the place of business. If he joins the union, he is then restricted by its leader as to place of work, hours of work (and therefore amount of compensation), and advancement in position, regardless of merit, and sometimes, by the dictum of the union leader, called out and prevented from work for days or weeks, although he has no real grievance, and he and his family are suffering for the want of necessities of life. In short, he is subjected to the arbitrary direction of the leader, and his personal independence is gone. Personal ambition to succeed and prosper is stifled.

This country will not stand for the "closed shop." It can not afford it. In the light of experience we know it would signify decreased production, increased cost of living, and initiative, development, and enterprise dwarfed. It would be the beginning of industrial decay and an injustice to the workmen themselves, who prosper only when industry succeeds. The "open shop" generally will be approved by them, for this permits them to engage in any employment, whether they are or are not members of a labor union.

It is appropriate, further, to emphasize what has been said many times in regard to our employees. Everyone, without exception, must be treated by all others justly and according to merit. In accordance with our established custom, one of our workmen, or a number of our workmen from any department, will continue to be received by the management to consider for adjustment any question presented.

It is the settled determination of the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries that the wages and working conditions of their employees shall compare favorably with the highest standards of propriety and justice. Misrepresentations have already been made and hereafter will be made; unfavorable criticisms may be indulged in by outsiders, especially by those who have little knowledge of the facts; our employees may be threatened and abused in the effort to influence them to join the union against their own desires; but, whatever the circumstances may be, we should proceed with the conduct of our business in the usual way and should give evidence to our employees that we mean to be fair with them.

#### WAGES.

The question of wages is not involved in the controversy. Few of the witnesses examined made any complaint as to wages. Some of them did contend that they should have 12-hour pay for 8-hour work, but most of them, while striking for an 8-hour day, claimed only a fair living wage. It is the opinion of the committee that, broadly speaking, the employees of the steel industry at the time of the strike were fairly well satisfied with the wages received, and that such question was not persuasive at all in any consideration of a strike.

The average wages in July, 1919, were \$6.27 per day. The wages of unskilled labor in 1914 for a 10-hour day were \$2; in 1919, for a 10-hour day, \$4.62. In July, 1914, the wages were \$2.40; in July, 1919, for a 12-hour day the wages were \$5.88. The lowest wage paid to grown men is 42 cents an hour for 8 hours, and 63 cents per hour, or time and a half, for all time over 8 hours. The lowest paid wages for unskilled labor is \$4.62 per day.

It may also be said that most of the men speak highly of such homes as are furnished by the company. There is undoubtedly great need of more homes to be sold to the men in order to encourage home owning. They rent these homes at very reasonable prices, and the general condition of these homes seems fairly good.



We find also little complaint as to lack of safety appliances, as to improved machinery, or as to conditions in general outside of the long hours of work. In encouraging and assisting its employees to become owners of its stock; in guarding its employees against accidental injuries; in caring for the sick; and in sanitary precautions generally the work of the United States Steel Corporation at the present time is in the main admirable, and in refreshing contrast to the shortsighted selfishness that still persists in many manufacturing concerns.

#### CAUSES OF THE STRIKE.

The underlying cause of the strike is the determination of the American Federation of Labor to organize the steel workers in opposition to the known and long-established policy of the steel industry against unionization. In this connection attention is called to subdivision "C" of title "The Steel Co.'s Answer to Labor's Claims." The seizing upon this cause by some radicals who are seeking to elevate themselves to power in the American Federation of Labor will be discussed later, but were it not for the attempt to unionize the mills the strike in all probability would not have occurred.

Other reasons are presented by the labor leaders and the laboring men who have gone on the strike, such as—

(a) The refusal of Mr. Gary to confer with the committee claiming to represent the employees. On pages 51 and 52 Mr. Fitzpatrick gives this as the reason why the strike was called.

(b) The denial of the right of the employees to be heard by their own representatives through spokesmen of their own choosing. (Mr. Gompers's testimony, pp. 88 and 110.)

(c) The demand for the right of collective bargaining to be brought about through unionization of the steel plants.

(d) The demand for an eight-hour day.

(e) The 12 demands of the organizers hereinbefore set forth not included in the above subdivisions.

We think, however, that those above mentioned, including subdivisions (a), (b), (c), and (d) are the fundamental ones, and that the other demands, included under (e), were not sufficient, in the judgment even of the employees, to warrant any strike.

#### THE STEEL CO.'S CLAIM AS TO REASONS FOR THE STRIKE.

(a) Attempt to make plants closed shops by unionizing.

(b) Interference of outsiders who do not represent the men employed and were not themselves workers in the mills.

(c) Radical elements bringing about the strike in order to secure control of the American Federation of Labor, backed by anarchists, Bolshevists, and I. W. W.'s.

It seems to us that this fairly represents the Steel Co.'s position as to the reasons for the strike.

#### THE STEEL CO.'S ANSWER TO LABOR'S CLAIMS.

(a) That the men who desired the conference did not represent the employees. Judge Gary (p. 172 of the testimony) claims that these men had not been asked to represent the employees; that they



were outside volunteers, and in any event (p. 208 of the testimony) he would not confer with representatives of the unions.

From the testimony:

Senator WALSH. You have no objection to unions in your plants. Is that right?

Mr. GARY. I do not know what you mean by that.

Senator WALSH. You recognize the right of the men to form unions?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Senator WALSH. But you refuse to confer with the representatives of the unions?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

(P. 208, steel strike hearings.)

(b) Answering the eight-hour day claim, the Steel Co. contends it is impossible to have the three shifts; that they can not get the men. An eight-hour day would mean three shifts instead of two. That they have adopted a basic eight-hour day as to pay; that the company is considering the question of establishing an eight-hour day.

(c) That the object of the organizers in unionizing the shops was to bring about a closed shop and that a closed shop means lessening of production.

With Judge Gary (and we speak of him as representing the Steel Co.) this seems to be the most important proposition. On page 170 of the evidence appears this:

Senator BORAH. Mr. Gary, this matter all resolves itself then into the single issue, stripped of everything else, that your organization does not propose to deal with representatives of unions as representatives of unions for the reason that you conceive that that would destroy the principle of the open shop?

Mr. GARY. Yes; that is true in every respect.

Senator BORAH. That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

Mr. GARY. Yes; that is a good statement of it.

(Steel strike hearings, p. 170.)

Again on page 166 of the testimony Judge Gary lays this down as the fundamental issue—the question of the open or the closed shop.

On the other hand both Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Gompers contend that the open or closed shop is not an issue. On pages 101 and 102 of the hearings Mr. Gompers testified as follows:

Mr. GOMPERS. In my letter and the several letters addressed to Judge Gary by the committee there was not the remotest reference to any question of closed shop or open shop. I assert, without any hesitation or fear of contradiction, that it was not in the minds of the committee and I know it was not in the mind of myself, to discuss the question of the open and closed shop if such conference were had. It has been simply—if I may use the vulgarism—lugged in by the judge in that letter that is read and in the publicity of the corporation that this controversy—

The CHAIRMAN (interrupting). Then you say that the closed shop is not an issue in this strike?

Mr. GOMPERS. It is not an issue, sir. You can imagine one of the common laborers, unskilled laborers, or skilled workers, if you please, as an individual, going to Judge Gary and presenting a grievance; or, even if not to Judge Gary, to the corporation's counsel, appointed by Judge Gary. You can imagine what chance of presentation would be afforded such poor devil by the representative of this millions and millions of dollars corporation. You can imagine how much courage a man would have in appearing before Judge Gary, or one of his representatives, to present either an individual grievance or a general grievance which the workers may have.

(d) That a large proportion of the strikers are foreigners; that few Americans have gone out on the strike and that most of the



foreigners do not know the reasons for the strike, but have merely followed the agitators and organizers who have held out to them all sorts of alluring promises as to what they would secure by a strike.

#### LABOR'S ANSWER TO THE CONTENTION OF THE STEEL CO.

(a) That a union shop is not necessarily a closed shop, and that the closed shop was not in any of the demands presented at the conference known as "the 12 demands." (Testimony Mr. Fitzpatrick, p. 52 of the record.) That in any event the question of closed shop could not arise until the plants had been unionized, and that Judge Gary's claim that the issue was either the closed or open shop was at least premature because that question could not arise until after the plants were unionized.

(b) That as to outsiders, the men were regular organizers; that while they are from a distance and do not work in the mills, that nevertheless they are selected to speak for the various labor organizations and that labor is entitled to be represented by the best it can secure, whether it be men working with them in the mills or men from without; that the strike shows they do represent a large proportion of the men as indicated by those who have gone out on the strike, which the labor leaders contend is over 200,000.

While they admit that a large percentage of the strikers are foreigners, and that there are some radical elements in their ranks, yet they contend that these radical elements in no way dominate or have had anything to do with bringing about the strike. That if there are a large number of foreigners working in the mills, which is admitted, that the Steel Co. and other large concerns are responsible for bringing them in and can not now be heard to blame them for the troubles brought about.

Such are the various claims of the parties to this dispute. Immediately prior to and during the strike it is also claimed upon the part of the labor representatives that free speech has been suppressed; that the right to meet and discuss their affairs has been denied to the men. Complaint is also made of the conduct during the strike of the State constabulary of Pennsylvania; that their methods have been brutal and unwarranted. Complaint is also made of the conduct of some of the lower magisterial courts in Pennsylvania in the forfeiting of bonds and the refusal to grant the right of counsel, and generally unfair conduct of cases as affecting strikers.

#### FAILURE TO POSTPONE STRIKE.

It would seem that the request of the President of the United States, backed up to a large degree by the request of the president of the American Federation of Labor to postpone the strike, should have been complied with. It is hardly sufficient answer to say that Judge Gary likewise declined to accede to the request of the President of the United States that he confer with the claimed representatives of the laborers of the United States Steel Co. with relation to the strike. Both parties, it seems to us, are at fault in refusing to heed the request of the President, and evidences upon both sides a lack of that consideration for that great third party, the public, which is always the greatest sufferer in a strike of this character. The



refusal of the labor leaders who seem to have been the guiding spirits of this strike to accede to the request of the President, even when backed to a certain degree by the president of the American Federation of Labor, lends weight to the idea that radical leadership, instead of conservative leadership, was taking possession of and guiding this particular strike. We regret that Mr. Gompers did not take a firmer position as to postponement.



## I.

In a hearing of this character, where there are many diverse questions arising, it is natural that there be differences of opinion on the part of the committee as to some of them. Some of the most difficult and far-reaching problems of our industrial life come to the front as issues in this strike. Upon some of them there is a difference of opinion among the various members of the committee. Some of these questions will be discussed later in the report. The committee, however, present these propositions:

(a) That the laborers in the steel mills had a just complaint relative to the long hours of service on the part of some of them and the right to have that complaint heard by the company.

(b) That they had the right to have the representatives of their own choosing present grievances to the employers. Some members of the committee believe that more friendly relations would be maintained between employer and employee if the representatives who are chosen to present grievances to the employers were actually working in the industry and that such representatives ought not to be from outside of the industry.

(c) That behind this strike there is massed a considerable element of I. W. W.'s, anarchists, revolutionists, and Russian soviets, and that some radical men not in harmony with the conservative elements of the American Federation of Labor are attempting to use the strike as a means of elevating themselves to power within the ranks of organized labor.

A few suggestions as to these findings will be in order. The evidence disclosed that a percentage of the men work 8 hours; a larger percentage 10 hours, and a lesser percentage 12 hours, although there is dispute in the evidence as to this proposition.

Judge Gary testifies that 34.8 per cent work 8 hours; 39.40 per cent work 10 hours; 26.52 per cent work 12 hours.

We believe that a large majority of the men actually working in the mills work 10 and 12 hours per day. While there are spells of rest here and there through these long periods of 10 and 12 hours, yet the fact remains that the general rule is either a 10 or 12 hour day, during which the men are on duty.

There has been some improvement in the steel industry in this respect, for some years ago a large percentage of the labor worked 10 and 12 hours a day and 7 days in the week. While the claim is made that the 7 day week has been abolished except in emergencies and the men who work on Sundays are allowed one week day for rest, the evidence on this point is conflicting.

We believe where continuous operation is absolutely necessary the men should at least be allowed one day's rest in each week.



The work in the steel mills is such that men must be constantly in attendance and the work does not stop. To change to an 8-hour day would mean three shifts instead of two. The Steel Co. claims that it is impossible to get the men. And further, that the men want to work more than 8 hours in order to get the additional pay, there being a basic 8-hour day as far as pay is concerned, and time and a half for all time over 8 hours.

It is true some of the workers testified that they wanted to work longer in order to get the increased compensation, but most of them seemed anxious for an 8-hour day with a living wage. The policy of working men 10 and 12 hours per day in the steel mills is, it seems to the committee, an unwise and un-American policy. There are many hundreds of thousands of employees in the steel mills, a considerable portion who can not read, speak, or write the English language. It is claimed by the Steel Co. that a very large proportion of those who are out on the strike are foreigners, which is defined in the evidence to be non-English-speaking people. The testimony sustains this contention.

The 8-hour day is involved in the solution of this question. These non-English-speaking aliens must be Americanized and must learn our language, so the question of a reasonable working day is involved in the question of Americanization. Men can not work 10 and 12 hours per day and attend classes at night school. It is the general consensus of opinion of the best economic writers and thinkers that the establishment of 8-hour-day systems does not diminish production. Nor do we think the claim made that an 8-hour day is impossible because the workmen can not be secured for three shifts is tenable. An 8-hour day with a living wage that will enable men to support their families and bring up their children according to the standards of American life ought to be a cardinal part of our industrial policy and the sooner the principle is recognized the better it will be for the entire country.

The public also has an interest in the problem of an 8-hour day. Fatigue in human kind is a breeder of unrest and dissatisfaction.

## II.

As to subdivision (b) of the findings of the committee, namely, the right of the men to select their own representatives to present their grievances, there should perhaps be an exception made. The representatives selected should be those who believe in the principles of the American Government. In the instance of Judge Gary refusing to receive a committee claiming to represent the men in the employment of the company, he could well have objected to receiving a man with the views of Mr. Foster. He did not put his refusal on that ground, but put it rather on the ground that the men did not represent the employees, though himself conceding that 10 to 15 per cent of the mills were probably unionized. It seems to us that even 10 to 15 per cent of the men had the right to select their own representatives and present their grievances to the steel company, and that they should have been heard. Judge Gary could have announced to them, as well as he did afterwards in his letters to the presidents of his subsidiary companies, that he would not deal with representatives of the unions, and that he considered the question one of



open and closed shop; likewise, it seems to us unfortunate that Mr. Gary did not answer the letter of Samuel Gompers, the accredited representative of the American Federation of Labor and president thereof. Such things do not tend to harmonize conditions but rather to accentuate them. The proposition under discussion raises the question of collective bargaining, unionism, closed and open shop, and on these propositions there is much controversy.

The committee is agreed that the principle of collective bargaining is a right of men working in industry. Collective bargaining has generally been recognized as a right of labor. It is apparently one of the effective methods that labor has used to secure its rights. The right of collective bargaining, however, should not be employed for the purpose of discriminating against any class of workmen whether union or nonunion men. Furthermore, the right when exercised should involve full responsibility on either side to abide by the terms of the bargain.

Judge Gary seems to believe that the question of open and closed shop is involved in the general proposition. There may be two kinds of closed shop as we understand it—a shop closed against nonunion men because they do not belong to a union and a shop closed against union men because they do belong to the union. One is a closed shop through the instrumentality of the men themselves who belong to the union and the other is a closed shop through the instrumentality of the employers. Both of such closed shops are un-American. The testimony taken does not disclose either class of closed shop existing in the steel industry. Men have the right in this country to work whether they belong to unions or not and no body of men has the right to stop other men working because they do not belong to a union. On the other hand, men have the right to join unions and to speak through their unions, and employers have no right to prevent joining unions or to discharge men or make their positions untenable or unpleasant because they have done so. The doctrine of collective bargaining as generally understood is not recognized in the steel mills, and this has caused considerable dissatisfaction upon the part of many of the steel workers. The question of the open and closed shop would not be involved except indirectly until in fact there was a substantial unionization of the plants. However, Judge Gary takes the position that the organization and unionization of the plants of necessity results in the closed shop. The difficult proposition in this matter continually arising is this: Does collective bargaining through union representatives result in a closed shop? If the unions would recognize the right of men to work and be treated as fellow workers even though they do not belong to the unions, it would not of necessity result in a closed shop. The question is one of great difficulty and the solution of it is not necessary in the view of the committee in order to present a report of conditions.

The committee not being entirely of one mind on the subject presents the facts and the variety of opinions to the Senate.

### III.

The testimony as introduced and the study the committee has made of the situation lead them to the conclusion that while there were legitimate complaints as to long hours of service, that the strike has been seized upon by some I. W. W.'s, Bolshevists, and anarchists to further their own interests, and that their influence in the strike has been powerful.



The committee is of the opinion that the American Federation of Labor has made a serious mistake and has lost much favorable public opinion which otherwise they would possess by permitting the leadership of this strike movement to pass into the hands of some who heretofore have entertained most radical and dangerous doctrines. If labor is to retain the confidence of that large element of our population which affiliates neither with labor organizations nor capital, it must keep men who entertain and formulate un-American doctrines out of its ranks and join with the employers of labor in eliminating this element from the industrial life of our Nation. Unquestionably, the United States Steel Corporation has had the support of a larger and of a wider circle in the country during the strike because of the character of some of the strike leadership. Labor organizations should not place the workingmen in the position of any sympathy with un-American doctrines or make them followers of any such leadership. Such practice will result in defeating the accomplishment of their demands.

Take the case of Mr. William Z. Foster. Mr. Foster is secretary to the committee composed of the 24 international unions managing this strike. His duties were substantially to act as secretary of the strike, to look after the organization of workers, and to handle the finances. He is in the office at Pittsburgh and seems to be the general manager of the strike. While it is claimed that he has had little to do with it, it is quite apparent to the committee that he has more to do with it than any other man in its actual management. He is one of the signers of the letter to the President and to Mr. Gary. He appears to be a man of excellent education, a thinker, and prolific writer. It is a source of regret to find that a man born in America should have written such doctrines as are set forth in his "Syndicalism" and his more recent publications. At the time of his writing "Syndicalism" he was wholly antagonistic to American labor unions, and especially to the American Federation of Labor. Soon after, however, he seems to have come to the conclusion that he could accomplish his aims and purposes better by boring from within, as he expressed it in one letter to Solidarity, the I. W. W. publication. Carrying out his doctrine of "boring from within" he became active in organized-labor work and soon became a leader.

We insert excerpts from his book showing that he believed that nothing was illegal if necessary to carry out his views. He advocated violence in strikes. He charged the American labor movement was infested with hordes of dishonest officials. He was closely associated with Mr. Margolis, present attorney for the I. W. W.'s at Pittsburgh, who has been behind this strike with all of his power; with Mr. Vincent St. John, formerly secretary to the I. W. W.'s, and the evidence convinces the committee there has been little change of heart on the part of Mr. Foster and that he is now in the full heyday of his power in the "boring from within" process.

Such men are dangerous to the country and they are dangerous to the cause of union labor. It is unfair to men who may be struggling for their rights to be represented by such leaders. It prevents them from securing proper hearing for their cause. If Mr. Foster has the real interest of the laboring man at heart he should remove himself from any leadership. His leadership injures instead



of helps. If he will not remove himself from leadership the American Federation of Labor should purge itself of such leadership in order to sustain the confidence which the country has had in it under the leadership of Mr. Gompers.

Mr. Foster's book on syndicalism and on trade-unions has been before the committee. These doctrines are subversive of government. Mr. Foster in the year 1911 was an admitted I. W. W. and attempted at the Labor Convention at Budapest to take the place of Mr. James Duncan, the duly accredited representative from this country. He wrote articles from abroad to *Solidarity*, the I. W. W. paper, signing them, "Yours for the revolution"; "Yours for the I. W. W." These letters breathe the spirit of anarchy.

#### EXTRACTS FROM "SYNDICALISM."

In his choice of weapons to fight his capitalist enemies, the Syndicalist is no more careful to select those that are "fair," "just," or "civilized" than is a householder attacked in the night by a burglar. He knows he is engaged in a life and death struggle with an absolutely lawless and unscrupulous enemy, and considers his tactics only from the standpoint of their effectiveness. With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be "legal" and "moral" or not does not concern him so long as they are effective. He knows that the laws, as well as the current code of morals, are made by his mortal enemies and considers himself about as much bound by them as a householder would himself by regulations regarding burglary adopted by an association of house-breakers. Consequently, he ignores them in so far as he is able and it suits his purposes. He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalist conceptions of "legality," "fairness," "right," etc., a greater power than his capitalist enemies have; and then to wrest from them by force the industries they have stolen from him by force and duplicity, and to put an end forever to the wages system. He proposes to bring about the revolution by the general strike. (P. 9.)

*The general strike and the armed forces.*—Once the general strike is in active operation the greatest obstacle to its success will be the armed forces of capitalism—soldiers, police, detectives, etc. This formidable force will be used energetically by the capitalists to break the general strike. The Syndicalists have given much study to the problem presented by this force and have found the solution for it. Their proposed tactics are very different from those used by rebels in former revolutions. They are not going to mass themselves and allow themselves to be slaughtered by capitalism's trained murderers in the orthodox way. There is a safer, more effective and more modern method. They are going to defeat the armed forces by disorganizing and demoralizing them. (P. 10.)

Syndicalists in every country are already actively preparing this disorganization of the armed forces by carrying on a double educational campaign amongst the workers. On the one hand, they are destroying their illusions about the sacredness of capitalist property and encouraging them to seize this property wherever they have the opportunity. On the other, they are teaching working class soldiers not to shoot their brothers and sisters who are in revolt, but, if need be, to shoot their own officers and to desert the army when the crucial moment arrives. This double propaganda of contempt for capitalist property "rights," and antimilitarism, are inseparable from the propagation of the general strike. (P. 11.)

*Bloodshed.*—Another favorite objection of ultra legal and peaceful Socialists is that the general strike would cause bloodshed.

This is probably true, as every great strike is accompanied by violence. Every forward pace humanity has taken has been gained at the cost of untold suffering and loss of life, and the accomplishment of the revolution will probably be no exception. But the prospect of bloodshed does not frighten the syndicalist worker, as it does the parlor Socialist. He is too much accustomed to risking himself in the murderous industries and on the hellish battle fields in the niggardly service of his masters, to set much value on his life. He will gladly risk it once, if necessary, in his own behalf. He has no sentimental regards for what may happen to his enemies during the general strike. He leaves them to worry over that detail. (P. 13.)



Perhaps the most widely practiced form of sabotage is the restriction by the workers of their output. Disgruntled workers all over the world instinctively and continually practice this form of sabotage, which is often referred to as "soldiering." The English labor unions, by the establishment of maximum outputs for their members, are widely and successfully practicing it. It is a fruitful source of their strength.

The most widely known form of sabotage is that known as "putting the machinery on strike." The syndicalist goes on strike to tie up industry. If his striking fails to do this, if strike breakers are secured to take his place, he accomplishes his purpose by "putting the machinery on strike" through temporarily disabling it. If he is a railroader he cuts wires, puts cement in switches, signals, etc., runs locomotives into turntable pits, and tries in every possible way to temporarily disorganize the delicately adjusted railroad system. If he is a machinist or factory worker, and hasn't ready access to the machinery, he will hire out as a scab and surreptitiously put emery dust in the bearings of the machinery or otherwise disable it. Oftentimes he takes time by the forelock, and when going on strike "puts the machinery on strike" with him by hiding, stealing, or destroying some small indispensable machine part which is difficult to replace. As is the case with all direct-action tactics, even conservative workers, when on strike, naturally practice this form of sabotage—though in a desultory and unorganized manner. This is seen in their common attacks on machines, such as street cars, automobiles, wagons, etc., manned by scabs.

Another kind of sabotage widely practiced by syndicalists is the tactics of either ruining or turning out inferior products. Thus, by causing their employers financial losses, they force them to grant their demands. The numerous varieties of this kind of sabotage are known by various terms such as "passive resistance," "obstructionism," "pearled strike," "strike of the crossed arms," etc. (P. 15.)

The syndicalist is as "unscrupulous" in his choice of weapons to fight his everyday battles as for his final struggle with capitalism. He allows no considerations of "legality," religion, patriotism, "honor," "duty," etc., to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics. The only sentiment he knows is loyalty to the interests of the working class. He is in utter revolt against capitalism in all its phases. His lawless course often lands him in jail, but he is so fired by revolutionary enthusiasm that jails, or even death, have no terrors for him. He glories in martyrdom, consoling himself with the knowledge that he is a terror to his enemies, and that his movement, to-day sending chills along the spine of international capitalism, to-morrow will put an end to this monstrosity. (P. 18.)

The syndicalist is a radical antipatriot. He is a true internationalist, knowing no country. He opposes patriotism, because it creates feelings of nationalism among the workers of the various countries and prevents cooperation between them, and also because of the militarism it inevitably breeds. He views all forms of militarism with a deadly hatred, because he knows from bitter experience that the chief function of modern armies is to break strikes, and that wars of any kind are fatal to the labor movement. He depends solely on his labor unions for protection from foreign and domestic foes alike and proposes to put an end to war between the nations by having the workers in the belligerent countries go on a general strike and thus make it impossible to conduct wars.

Another difference between industrial unionism and syndicalism is that the former puts emphasis on the industrial form of organization and the "one big union" idea, while the latter emphasizes revolutionary tactics. Industrial unionists also preach the doctrine that there are no leaders in the revolutionary movement, whereas a fundamental principle of syndicalists is that of the militant minority (outlined in ch. 9). (P. 32.)

The working class, whose sole defense they are against the capitalist class, is in retreat before the latter's attacks. If this course is to be arrested and the workers started upon the road to emancipation, the American labor movement must be revolutionized. It must be placed upon a syndicalist basis. (P. 36.)

*Labor fakers.*—The American labor movement is infested with hordes of dishonest officials who misuse the power conferred upon them to exploit the labor movement to their own advantage, even though this involves the betrayal of the interests of the workers. The exploits of these labor fakers are too well known to need recapitulation here. Suffice to say the labor faker must go. (P. 39.)

*Distinction between syndicalist*



In the foregoing pages only the more important evils afflicting American labor unionism have been gone into and their remedies indicated. Lack of space forbids the discussion of the many minor ones with which it bristles. But the rebel worker, in his task of putting the American labor movement upon a syndicalist basis, will have no difficulty in recognizing them and their antidotes when he encounters them. (P. 42.)

The S. L. of N. A. is demonstrating that the American labor movement is ripe for a revolution and that the conservative forces opposed to this revolution are seemingly strong only because they have had no opposition. It is making them crumble before the attacks of the militant minority, organized and conscious of its strength. (P. 47.)

We call attention also in this connection to the testimony of Mr. Margolis, who at least is entitled to credit for frankness in expounding his abominable doctrines before the committee. He is not a member of the Federation of Labor and has no connection with it, but he has rallied to the support of this strike in the Pittsburgh district the I. W. W. and anarchistic elements of the population. He has had strong influence with the Union of Russian Workers and secured their support for the strike. He admits that they are anarchists; he admits that he is an anarchist. He has been a close associate of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, and attempted to organize at Pittsburgh all the various organizations antagonistic to government. He assisted in spreading anarchistic literature and I. W. W. journals. He himself is against all government. He is the kind of man who would not, as he himself testified, use any force against a man robbing his house or assailing his wife. He is apparently on close terms with Mr. Foster. While he criticizes him for having given up his syndicalistic views, he leaves the impression that he believes Foster still has those views "in the back of his head," and that he had become a member of the American Federation of Labor for the purpose of better carrying out the policies that he really had in mind and to which he was sincerely attached.

Mr. Margolis is a highly educated man, a good speaker, and the kind of man who is calculated to do immense harm. He cares not for the country which by law protects him. He desires to dissolve this Government by peaceful means. He has no sympathy for our American institutions. Mr. Margolis has many followers. He is a writer for the I. W. W. magazines and is a type of the overpeaceable and ultradangerous citizen. We recommend to Senators that they read the testimony of Mr. Margolis as taken before this committee.

Mr. Foster apparently also is more or less closely associated with Mr. Vincent St. John, a notable I. W. W. worker, and Mr. St. John is also closely associated with Mr. Margolis. Mr. Foster thought enough of Mr. St. John's views to quote him in his book on "Syndicalism," and Mr. St. John has been in Pittsburgh just prior to the strike. And while Mr. Foster denies any particular consultation with him, he admits having seen him. That Mr. Vincent St. John has been active as to the steel strike; that he is closely associated with Margolis and with Foster is shown by a letter written to Margolis by St. John, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., August 16, 1919.

FRIEND MARGOLIS: Anent that article I was to mail you—they want to reproduce it in Sol here so I let them have it. After which they promise to mail it to me, and I will see that you get it; that is, if they do not run it. If they do, of course, you will see it in the Sol.

Things are looking a little better here, and from press reports there is something stirring throughout the country.



Just while I think of it, if you have a chance to talk matters over with Foster on possible developments in case of a strike in steel, I think it would be a good thing to do so. It might be possible to frustrate treacherous action by international officials should a strike occur—and I think a strike is assured.

Regards to all the bunch.

Sincerely,

V. ST. JOHN.

The evidence before the committee showed great activity at Gary among those who would be termed "Reds," and while it would be unfair to say that they were the leading force behind the strike, it is fair to say that they were doing everything they could to help it.

Lieut. Van Buren, of the Regular Army, testified before the committee as to the great activities of anarchists found in Gary: Large quantities of anarchistic literature were found: some in homes, some in places of public meeting—Russian anarchistic literature, socialist literature, Slovakian and other nationalities. It was somewhat interesting, though distressing, to hear from him that all the foreign societies were rather prosperous in Gary, and the only society that had gone out of business was the American society. This literature is being generally circulated. It is the literature of the soviet. Its poison is being instilled into the minds of men who know nothing about this country, and apparently no effort is being made to have them know anything about it. We do not mean this as a reflection upon the American Federation of Labor. We would rather make it as a plea to the Federation to purge itself of these men.

Labor has done a great work in the war. It has stood nobly by the purposes of this country. It can not now afford to harbor men who in their hearts desire to destroy this Government.

We insert a part of the declaration adopted during the war by the National and International Trade Unions of America.

We, the officers of the National and International Trade Unions of America, in national conference assembled in the Capital of our Nation, hereby pledge ourselves in peace or in war, in stress or in storm, to stand unreservedly by the standards of liberty and the safety and preservation of the institutions and ideals of our Republic.

In this solemn hour of our Nation's life it is our earnest hope that our Republic may be safeguarded in its unswerving desire for peace; that our people may be spared the horrors and the burdens of war; that they may have the opportunity to cultivate and develop the arts of peace, human brotherhood, and a higher civilization.

But, despite all our endeavors and hopes, should our country be drawn into the maelstrom of the European conflict, we, with these ideals of liberty and justice herein declared, as the indispensable basis for national policies, offer our services to our country in every field of activity to defend, safeguard, and preserve the Republic of the United States of America against its enemies whomsoever they may be, and we call upon our fellow workers and fellow citizens in the holy name of labor, justice, freedom, and humanity to devotedly and patriotically give like service.

(Steel strike hearings, p. 117.)

This breathes a lofty spirit of patriotism.

No man did more than Mr. Gompers in standing against Bolshivism and in instilling patriotic desire into the minds of American labor. In a magazine for April, 1919, in an article of Mr. Gompers, he says:

America is not merely a name, a land, a country, a continent; America is a symbol. It is an ideal, the hope of the world.

It is the duty of every citizen to stand by his country in times of stress and war as well as during times of peace. The man who would not fight, or make



the supreme sacrifice, if necessary, to save and protect his home and his country, who would not fight for liberty, is undeserving and unworthy of living in a free country.

(Steel strike hearings, p. 131.)

Again he says in the same article:

I do not know that I am entitled to very great credit because I am not a Bolshevik. With my understanding of American institutions and American opportunities, I repeat that the man who would not be a patriot in defense of the institutions of our country would be undeserving the privilege of living in this country.

If I thought that Bolshevism was the right road to go, that it meant freedom, justice, and the principles of humane society and living conditions, I would join the Bolsheviks. It is because I know that the whole scheme leads to nowhere, that it is destructive in its efforts and in its every activity, that it compels reaction and brings about a situation worse than the one it has undertaken to displace, that I oppose and fight it.

(Steel strike hearings, p. 133.)

In an article in McClures, May, 1919, as found in the record (p. 134), Mr. Gompers sounded forth a trumpet call of Americanism. As a sample we quote the following:

Our country is now facing a crisis to meet which continuity of war production is essential. Workers, decide every industrial question fully mindful of those men—fellow Americans—who are on the battle line, facing the enemies' guns, needing munitions of war to fight the battle for those of us back at home, doing work necessary but less hazardous. No strike ought to be inaugurated that can not be justified to the men facing momentary death. A strike during the war is not justified unless principles are involved equally fundamental as those for which fellow citizens have offered their lives—their all.

We must give this service without reserve until the war is won, serving the cause of human freedom, intelligent, alert, uncompromising wherever and whenever the principle of human freedom is involved.

We are in a great revolutionary period which we are shaping by molding everyday relations between man and man. Workers of America as well as all other citizens have difficult tasks to perform that we might hand on to the future the ideals and institutions of America not only unimpaired but strengthened and purified in spirit and expression, thus performing the responsible duty of those intrusted with the high resolve to be free and perpetuate freedom.

(Steel strike hearings, p. 137.)

There is a startling contrast between the words of Foster and these words. This is the language of the man who attempted to secure a postponement of this strike at the request of the President of the United States. The laborers were contending for American principles in contending for an eight-hour day. They can not put the management of a campaign for American principles into the hands of men who do not believe in American doctrines and hope to succeed.

There may be, in view of the radical utterances and actions of certain leaders, some warrant for the belief that the strike in the steel industry is a part of a general scheme and purpose on the part of radical leaders to bring about a general industrial revolution. The committee, however, do not go to that extent because they feel there were some real grievances. While Mr. Gompers did not originally participate in counseling or advising the strike, he subsequently indorsed it and put the power of his influence behind it. In view of his standing and patriotism the committee does not believe that he could be a participant in a movement involving such revolution.

As to the active support of the I. W. W.'s in the strike we insert an article from the October issue of the I. W. W. magazine "The One Big Union." Said article is as follows:



## OUR PROGRAM IN THE STEEL DISTRICT.

[By Harold Lord Varney, Secretary-Treasurer of Metal and Machinery Workers I. U. No. 300.]

By courtesy of Fellow Worker Sandgren, I have read the monograph of Mr. Margolis in manuscript. Its point of view is refreshing and illuminative. Written as it is, in the very glare of the onrushing steel strike, it is a strong message of the moment. Perhaps before these words are even printed, hundreds of thousands of steel slaves will be on the firing line of a great general strike. And then the problem, which Mr. Margolis raises, will become acute and tense.

Let me state here—positively and for all time—that the I. W. W. has no feud with the “borer from within.” We do not advocate “boring from within” tactics. Not officially. But we are not entirely blind to the fact that labor’s surge runs in many molds which are not of our making. That thousands of workers—I. W. W. workers—have been forced by circumstance to find their economic expression in the extreme wings of the A. F. of L. That there they are accomplishing a veritable revolution in thought and tactics. As an independent movement, the I. W. W. can not, of course, indorse them. But as a revolutionary movement, the I. W. W. can not but realize that all roads—even the roads of the A. F. of L. “borer”—lead inexorably home to the I. W. W.

In other words, the I. W. W. attitude can be described as one of unofficial tolerance toward all “one big union” movements. Be it the Canadian C. B. U., Seattle Duncanism, Detroit and its auto workers, or the Fosterized steel union of Pittsburgh, we who are I. W. W.’s throw no barriers in their way. When they strike, we strike with them. When they feel the vengeance of the A. F. of L., we come to their defense. When they stumble and grope for guidance, it is the I. W. W. which lifts them up. This is the task and duty which those who are I. W. W.’s have assumed.

But beyond a certain point the I. W. W. does not yield. And this is the point of autonomy. Many emotional persons, seeing the success of these tactics in local instances, are swept away. “Let us abandon the beaten track of I. W. W. autonomy,” they cry. “Let us all go into the A. F. L. and capture it!” they cry out shrilly in meetings. They bombard the press with their naïve importunings. Syndicalists, they call themselves, and again and again they have paralyzed the morale of our organization by their luring arguments for a “change.”

Such people lose sight of the one indelible fact of the I. W. W. movement. For the I. W. W. is not a mere labor union, neither is it a band of evangelists. The I. W. W. is first, last, and all the time an architectural movement. We are constructing a new society. Our unions are organs of this new society. And only as we enter every industry and build there the first frail foundation of our new industrial system, are we making progress toward our great goal. By building industrial unions in each industry, we gather into our movement the human material which is to be the cornerstone of the new system; the militant minority who are to wage the victorious fight; the constructive element of the working class, who will study the task of the future in the I. W. W. of the present, and who will be trained for industrial management in the school-house of the present-day I. W. W. movement.

There is a certain spirit, a certain quality in the I. W. W., which one finds nowhere else in the American labor movement, and it is a quality which has transmitted itself to every I. W. W. member. This is the quality of constructive proletarianism. Always the acts of the I. W. W. are shadowed by our goal—the goal to “build a new society within the shell of the old”; or, in other words, the architectural spirit.

Now this spirit can find expression in no other form than the form of independent unionism. The man who “bores from within” is consumed with the duties of polemics; he has no time for construction. The wobbly who squanders his energy “capturing” other movements has no energy left to build his own. The worker who toils unceasingly to “make the A. F. of L. revolutionary,” may accomplish his immediate goal and lose his final one. For of what value are revolutions to the proletariat if our tactics fail to train our class for the duties of self-administration which will follow the revolution? Better to build a small movement, which shall be solid and invincible in its economic genius, than to capture all the workers of America into a blind, wobbling mob. The I. W. W. moves slowly, but we are rearing a new industrial civilization with every step we make. Ours not to capture but to build!



In the steel industry to-day, such is the I. W. W. program. We have a dual union to the Fosterized A. F. or L. But we are not fighting that A. F. or L.; on the contrary, we are cooperating with it at every step in the fight. Many of our members are in the Steel Workers' Union; some of them sit in the councils of that body. But still we have our own union. Throughout the steel district we have a far-flung human trench of I. W. W. job delegates. And we are lining up the steel workers into Metal and Machinery Workers I. U. No. 300.

Here the steel workers catch the tang of the real fight. Here they are recalled to the truth that the steel union and the steel strike is only an incident; that behind it is the background of a world-wide class struggle and that this struggle will bring victory only when the workers are capable of industrial control. Here they find themselves by the side of I. W. W. miners, I. W. W. lumberjacks, I. W. W. construction workers, I. W. W. transport men. They are no longer bound in a single union; they are in a class organization, and the spirit of class wideness gives the vision of a new society.

Let Foster build his one big union; may it grow, may it increase, may it win its battle with the Steel Trust. But though we may be called "orthodox," we of the I. W. W. will still toil for our I. W. W. one big union—and we know that when we have at last built it we have also built a new society.

#### IV.

We have not discussed the 12 demands of the organizers, but only a portion of them. They were undoubtedly to be used as a basis for compromise, and we see no particular need in the discussion of any of them except those heretofore considered.

Since the strike there has been complaint that the strikers have been denied the right of free speech, and that the treatment by the officers has been brutal and that their treatment in the courts does not accord with the high ideals of American democracy. In some places all meetings have been denied. In others street meetings have been denied and indoor meetings permitted. The orders of the mayors and burgesses that no outdoor public meetings, or, in some places, no public meetings should be held, was most distasteful to them. While apparently they were trying to obey this order, they regard it as aimed wholly at them. They are to be commended for their observance of law and order. It may be open to question whether permits to hold meetings should have been denied to the workers, and while generally the orders denying permits were obeyed, yet in most instances where clashes occurred or arrests made it was because of attempts to hold meetings after the request for a permit had been denied.

Freedom of speech is one of the bulwarks of American liberty. Freedom of speech does not, however, mean unbridled license. It does not mean the right of men to advocate the overthrow of this Government, but it seems to us that where a strike is carried on in a peaceful way that the least possible amount of restraint and the largest freedom of speech where meetings are conducted in an orderly way is certainly to be desired in the America Republic. The suppression of frank discussion only serves to accentuate a bad situation.

Officials should not hesitate to prevent meetings called together for the purpose of advocating the overthrow of the Government. On the other hand, they ought not to be permitted to prevent men meeting and talking over their grievances and presenting to the men their arguments in favor of joining the union or refraining



from joining the union. Incidents have been presented to the committee of unnecessary force by police officers. Probably there will always be abuses in times of excitement, but apparently there have been cases of unoffending men and women arrested without reason by the officers, put into jail, and in some cases fined by magistrates without warrant or justification. It is not necessary to refer to special cases as disclosed by the evidence. The action in many instances was such as to lead one side of this controversy to the belief that the officers of the law were acting on the side of the Steel Co. Such a situation is unfortunate and helps to breed discontent. As long as officers are human beings they will make mistakes. They should be very careful that in maintaining the majesty and dignity of the law they do nothing to bring it into disrespect.

As to the complaint of the action of the courts, we are inclined to believe that there is some ground for complaint and that the magisterial courts in the taking of bonds and the forfeiting of bonds, in the arresting of people merely as suspicious characters and sending them to jail therefor, has not in every instance been justifiable. The courts should be very careful that they are not subject to just criticism for curtailing the rights of defendants.

The foreigners whom the needs of our industries bring among us can not be dragooned into love for America and loyalty to its institutions. Public officials should always be ready to receive sympathetic suggestions for the relief of just complaints or violations of or interference with the legal or humane rights of labor, as well as the insistence upon a protection of the property rights of capital and the preservation of law and order.

## V.

We have thus far discussed the situation as pertaining to the employer and the employee. There is a third party, however, to all of this controversy—the great public. There is no place in this country either for industrial despotism or labor despotism. No one should be permitted to unjustly cause the great body of the public to suffer. Strikes are a relic of industrial barbarism, but at present strikes are apparently the only way for labor to secure even its just demands if employers refuse to grant them or to submit them to arbitration. It is not to the credit of our Nation that no way has been devised to settle these disputes outside of strikes. They are destructive and wrecking to the industrial life of the Nation. Somebody has to pay the bill and in every instance it is the public. The public has a right to demand that capital shall not arrogate to itself the right to determine in its own way these industrial questions, and it is the same as to labor, and the duty is upon the Congress as representing the people to provide some means for the adjustment of these difficulties. This was done during the war through the War Labor Board and their action was fairly satisfactory.

Before suggesting remedies the committee desires to make these observations: A large percentage of the strikers are foreigners. By this we mean unnaturalized citizens. Passing now the question of the responsibility for these men being here, it is suggested that, while America welcomes those who come from foreign shores who desire



to become American citizens and enjoy the great liberties and opportunities of American life, yet those who come for the purpose of stirring up trouble against this Government and attempting to undermine it and overthrow it should be escorted to the water edge and shipped back to the land from which they came. If the laws are now sufficient such characters should be deported at once. If they are not sufficient Congress should immediately enact laws covering this serious situation. Men who try to destroy a government should not be permitted to appeal to that government to protect them in the processes of destruction.

Another question, closely involved is this: There are in this country working in the factories, mines, and mills thousands of men who can not read, speak, or write the American language. Many do not know and can not know the purposes and ideals of this Government. While in the Government, they are not a part of it. These men must be given the benefit of some education. They must be given the opportunity to learn the American language and start on the road to American citizenship. It is an unhealthy condition of affairs when so many thousands of men and their families have so little knowledge of the country in which they live, its history, its institutions, its desires, and its language.

#### REMEDIES.

While the committee was not under the resolution asked to suggest remedies, it feels it would fall short of its duty if it did not make some suggestions to Congress along remedial lines. Some of the suggestions are not directly involved in the steel strike, but they come to the minds of the committee from the evidence that they have taken and conditions they have observed.

First. That a board or commission somewhat similar to the War Labor Board should be established. This board to have power of compulsory investigation; to have large power in mediation and conciliation and recommendations; not to the extent of compulsory arbitration, but before this board controversies could be heard, investigations made, and decisions rendered. That pending said investigation and decision no strike should be declared provided no employees are discharged for taking part in the controversy and provided further that all opportunity for the employer to take advantage of the delay has been removed; that the principle of collective bargaining and an 8-hour day should be considered by said board, and recommendations made to labor and industry in relation thereto; that the board should be in the nature of a Federal industrial commission, seeking at all times not only to settle pending disputes but to help bring about a more harmonious condition between employer and employee. A just decision of said board would be indorsed by the public and public sentiment is powerful enough to enforce the findings of such a commission. There is good sense enough among the great body of the American people to bring about an adjustment of these difficulties. The great body of the American people believe in a liberal industrial system, in living wages for men employed in industry; wages that will permit them to raise their families according to the standards of American life and to enjoy recreation from hard, grinding toil; but the American people have no patience and will have none



with any leadership that seeks to accomplish its purposes by barbarous methods of freezing or starving the American people. They do not propose to freeze and they do not propose to be starved, and they do not propose that a few men in this country shall have the power to bring about such condition of affairs. On the other hand, they are as much opposed to an autocracy of capital. Capital must be reasonable likewise. The employer must recognize that there is a new spirit in the world; that labor is not content to be merely a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, and that labor is fighting for a status in industrial life, and it is not concerned merely with wages.

Why can not capital and labor cooperate and establish between themselves the doctrine of the square deal; cease to be suspicious of one another, join together and act together for the good of each other and for the well-being of the public at large? It is the hope of the world that military warfare has ceased. Have we not reason also to hope and insist that industrial warfare may cease? It can not without a spirit of mutual cooperation between capital and labor.

Second. That an Americanization bill be passed by the Congress which will provide for the effective education and Americanization of the illiterate foreigners and native illiterates in this country. A bill of this kind has already been reported out of this committee and your committee urges an early adoption of the same by Congress.

Third. It is observable in the strike districts that the men who own their homes are more contented and more interested in the affairs of the country. One real antidote for unrest in this country is home ownership. It is difficult to plant the seeds of revolution in the minds of those who own their own homes. The work of the steel companies in building homes has been most commendable. It is to be hoped that such work will be enlarged and carried on by them. It would not be out of place to suggest that it would be most commendable for the steel companies to use some of their large profits in extending the work of home building. The question of aid and encouragement in the work of assisting townspeople of small means in securing their own homes in some such way as the farmer has been aided under the Federal farm loan act is worthy the serious consideration of Congress.

Fourth. There should be a change in our naturalization laws which will require the naturalization and some education of all foreigners, at least to the extent of speaking the American language; that they should acquire such knowledge within a period of five years after they arrive, with proper limitations upon further immigration, giving to those already here a certain period of time in which to become naturalized, and if this is not done then deportation should follow.

Fifth. An effective law should be passed dealing with anarchists, revolutionists, and all who would destroy the American Government. There are too many Americans who love their country and are willing to give their life for it and who intend that all the doors of American opportunity shall remain open for the children of to-day and the children of to-morrow to permit a few thousand anarchists, revolutionists, and I. W. W.'s to keep on with their nefarious propaganda to destroy the Government.



The views here expressed fairly represent the conclusions arrived at by the committee. We present the report to the Senate with the hope that out of it may come some remedial legislation, and, if not, with the belief that good must come of an investigation of this character where the light of publicity has been turned upon the entire transaction. We have tried to go to the bottom of the causes of this strike. We have heard both sides impartially, and proceeded without fear and without favor, solely with a determination to arrive at the truth.

WILLIAM S. KENYON.

THOMAS STERLING.

LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS.

✓KENNETH MCKELLAR.

✓DAVID I. WALSH.





















UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 039587370